

Pia Carolla

Priscus of Panion, John Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale* (CP): a Complex Relationship*

Michael Jeffreys has recently recommended to give the *Chronicon Paschale* (CP from hereon) the appropriate importance in the Tübingen on-line philological commentary on Malalas,¹ because on the latter the CP directly draws. This is, more or less, the *communis opinio*: the CP rearranges events found in the so-called “first edition” of Malalas with the help of a “putative Constantinopolitan city chronicle”, i.e. a lost Greek chronicle, with a list of emperors and consuls in a solid chronological grid, to be paralleled in Latin by Marcellinus Comes.²

* I wish to warmly thank Erika Juhász and László Horváth for their kind invitation and wonderful organization of the 4th International Colloquium; the staff at the Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest and particularly the student Simon Gergely for a very friendly welcome; Erika Juhász also for her remarkable care of the proceedings. My grateful thought goes to Christian Gastgeber and the project FWF P 25485 at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, for their support. Special thanks are to be given to Peter Schreiner, Silvia Ronchey, Paolo Odorico, Juan Signes Codoñer, Laura Carrara, Sergei Mariev, Andrea Ghidoni and Erika Elia for insightful discussions.

¹ Tübingen, Historisch-philologischer Kommentar zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas: <http://www.haw.uni-heidelberg.de/forschung/forschungsstellen/malalas/projekt.de.html>. Thanks to be given to Mischa Meier and Christine Radtki for having me involved in the “Malalas-Tagungen”; see CAROLLA, P., John Malalas in the *Excerpta Constantiniana de Insidiis* (EI): a Philological and Literary Perspective. In: MEIER, M. – RADTKI, CHR. – SCHULZ, F. (eds.), *Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas. Autor, Werk, Überlieferung*. (Malalas Studien 1) Stuttgart 2016, 239–252; CAROLLA, P., *New Fragments of Priscus from Panion in John Malalas? Issues of language, style and sources*. In: MEIER, M. – CARRARA, L. – RADTKI, CHR. (eds.), *Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas. Quellenfragen*. (Malalas Studien 2) Stuttgart 2017 (forthcoming).

² See, e.g., WHITBY, M. – WHITBY, M., Introduction. In: WHITBY, M. – WHITBY, M., (eds.), *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, (Translated Texts for Historians) Liverpool 1989, xviii; JEFFREYS, E., Malalas’ Sources. In: JEFFREYS, E. – CROKE, B. – SCOTT, R. (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas*. (Byzantina Australiensia 6) Sydney 1990, 167–216: 152; MEIER, M. – DROSHN, CL. – PRIWITZER, ST., Einleitung. In: JOHANNES MALALAS, *Weltchronik*, THURN, J. (†) – MEIER, M. (transl.), (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 69) Stuttgart 2009, 8.

In this paper I try to take a different view: the section of the *CP* about the emperors Theodosius II (408–450 AD) and Marcianus (450–457 AD) does not show a direct dependence on, but a complex relationship with Malalas' book 14: sometimes they are identical, sometimes close, sometimes very different.

As this is the section of both works where Priscus of Panion is explicitly quoted,³ their relationship with Priscus can be relevant to assess provenance. In examining the texts, I also show some results about the *usus scribendi* of Priscus (i.e., his linguistic and literary peculiarities), the basis my critical edition of the author from Panion has been built on.⁴

To shed light on the issue, first of all (i) we look into the section in question, both in Malalas and in the *CP*, to assess the big picture: i.e., which are the links between the two and where differences can be found in both texts. Then (ii) we take a sample of closeness between Malalas and the *CP*: Attila's story, his life and death; finally (iii), a case of difference between the two texts is considered: Gaiseric and the sack of Rome in 455 AD.

The research shows some clues which point to a new hypothesis about the relationship Malalas/*CP*.

1. a) A problematic section: Malalas & *CP* about Theodosius II-Marcianus

Let us have a closer look at the text structure of Malalas, *Chronographia* XIV 10–34 (pp. 279–290 Thurn⁵), from Theodosius II's advent to Marcianus' death, comparing *CP*, pp. 587–594 Dindorf.

To help the reader in grasping the situation, I give two tables: firstly (Table 1), the order of Malalas' chapters with the parallel sections of the *CP*, whose different sequence is indicated with letters (A, B, C... P; ... U);⁶ secondly (Table 2), the order of the *CP* against Malalas.

³ See Table 1 below, Malal. *Chron.* XIV 10 and *CP* 587,7 Dindorf.

⁴ PRISCUS PANITA, *Excerpta et Fragmenta*, CAROLLA, P. (ed.), (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum Teubneriana) Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2008. See also Given's translation: GIVEN, J., *The Fragmentary History of Priscus. Attila, the Huns and the Roman Empire AD 430–476*. (Christian Roman Empire Series 11) Merchantville NJ 2014. I usually quote also the correspondence with Blockley's numeration of Priscus' fragments, see BLOCKLEY, R. C. (ed.), *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus. II. Text, Translation and Historiographical Notes*. (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 10) Liverpool 1983, 222–376.

⁵ *Joannis Malalae Chronographia*, THURN, J. (ed.), (CFHB 35) Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2000.

⁶ For *CP*'s sequence, see Table 2.

In both sequences the factual (i.e., historical) *errors* are highlighted in ***bold Italics***; CP's additions on / differences from Malalas are simply **bold**.

Table 1. Theodosius II & Marcianus.

Parallels between Malalas XIV 10–34 (pp. 279–290 Thurn) and CP, pp. 587–594 Dindorf

CONTENTS	Malalas, <i>Chronographia</i> XIV. chapt.	<i>Chronicon</i> <i>Paschale</i> , p. Dindorf	Other witnesses
Attila's threat to both <i>partes imperii</i>	10 περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκοις ὁ Θραξ.	B 587,7–588,5 περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκοις ὁ Θραξ.	End of <i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 2 (16,9– 15 Mai)
Theodosius II's foundations (Alexandria)	11	NO	
Hypatia's death; Earthquake in Crete	12	NO	
Theodosius II's foundations (Antiochia)	13 (lacuna at the beg.)	NO; Eudocia at Antioch, 585,8–16 (see fr. Tuscul. 2)	Evagrius, <i>Historia</i> <i>Ecclesiastica</i> I 18 (27,18–31 Bidez/ Parmentier); <i>Excerpta de Insidiis</i> (EI) 160,21–22 de Boor (summary)
Valentinianus' death	14 [<i>Malalas'</i> <i>ERROR: under</i> <i>Theodosius II</i>]	M 591,19–592,1 Correctly in 455	EI 160,22–24 de Boor
Antiochus' disgrace	15	NO	Theophanes AM 5936; 96,18–21 de Boor
Cyrus' disgrace	16	C 588,6–589,5	Theophanes AM 5937; 96,31–97,15 de Boor
Antiochus Chuzon prefect	17	NO	

CONTENTS	Malalas, <i>Chronographia</i> XIV. chapt.	<i>Chronicon</i> <i>Paschale</i> , p. Dindorf	Other witnesses
Rufinus' disgrace	18	NO	Beginning of <i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3 (17,1–2 Mai) ≈ end of Malalas' chapter
Power of Chrysaphius	19	NO	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3 (17,3–8 Mai); <i>Excerpta de</i> <i>Virtutibus et Vitiis</i> (EV) 162,25–163,2 Büttner-Wobst ; Theophanes AM 5941; 100,16; AM 5943; 103,29–33
Earthquake in Nicomedia and re-building of the city	20	NO	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
Raid by the Isaurians in Seleucia of Syria	21	NO	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
Earthquake in Constantinople	22	D 589,6–16 with additions NOT from Malal. ⁷	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
General Procopius vs. Persians; Areobindus vs. Ardazanes.	23	NO	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
Provinces and cities of the East	24	NO	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
Nestorius and the council of Ephesus	25	581,11–20 [rightly far before than in Malalas' narration];	<i>Fragmentum</i> <i>Tusculanum</i> 3
II council of Ephesus	NO	A 587,3–6 [450 instead of 449, CP's error]	

⁷ “[...] probably not from Malalas” according to JEFFREYS, M. – JEFFREYS, E. – SCOTT, R. (transl.), *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation*. (Byzantina Australiensia 4) Melbourne 1986, 199 *ad loc.* See CROKE, B., Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration. *Byzantion* 51 (1981) 122–147: 142–144.

CONTENTS	Malalas, <i>Chronographia</i> XIV. chapt.	<i>Chronicon</i> <i>Paschale</i> , p. Dindorf	Other witnesses
Eudossia calls Gaiseric to Rome	26	N 592,2–7 [very different from Malalas and the others]	<i>Fragmentum Tusculanum</i> 3 (end of the fragm.) Evagr. 2,7 (54,10–30 Bidez-Parmentier) Theophanes 108,17– 109,9 de Boor Cedren. 605,16– 606,16 Theod. Scut. 83,24– 84,12 Zonar. III. 119,7– 121,3 Proc. <i>bell.</i> III. 4,38; 5,3–4; 6 Nic. Call. Xanth. <i>HE</i> PG 147 36B–37D; Theod. Lect. 103,8– 12 Hansen
Theodosius II's death	27 [<i>Malalas'</i> <i>ERROR: after the sack of Rome a. 455</i>]	E 589,17–590,5	Evagr. (pp. 32,31–33,2 Bidez- Parmentier) Leo Gramm. p. 109,4–11 Georg. Mon. 604,9–10 Zonar. III. 112,3–4
Marcianus emperor	28	G 590,6–15	Evagr. 38,18–20 Bidez-Parmentier; Joann. Nik. 87, 44; Theophanes 103, 8 de Boor Georg. Mon. 610,14–15 Leo Gramm. 111, 10–12 Cedren. 602,23 etc. Theod. Scut. 79,11 Zonar. III. 113,6
Earthquake in Tripolis (Phoenicia)	29	NO	Chron. Anon. pseudo-Dionys. 766

CONTENTS	Malalas, <i>Chronographia</i> XIV. chapt.	<i>Chronicon</i> <i>Paschale</i> , p. Dindorf	Other witnesses
Pulcheria finds relics of the 40 martyrs	NO	H 590,16–20	
Council in Chalcedon	30	I 591,1–4 [<i>a.</i> 452 (sic), with additions]	Theophanes 105,21 de Boor; Georg. Mon. 611,20–612,1 Niceph. Chron. 98,2–5 Joann. Nik. 87,42
Ransom of Eudossia and Placidia from Gaiseric	31	U [<i>i. e.</i> , FAR AFTERWARDS than Malalas' narration] 594,4–10 [with additions]	Zonar. III. 120,16–17
Chrysaphius' death	32	F 590,6–7	EV 163,2–5; Theophanes 103,33 de Boor; Cedren. 603,10; Theod. Scut. 79,16 Theod. Lect. 100,8 Hansen
Marcianus' daughter marries Anthemius	33	NO	
Pulcheria's death	34 third part [<i>sub a. 455</i> , <i>Malalas' ERROR</i>]	J 6	Theophanes 106,25 de Boor; Georg. Mon. 610,21; Leo Gramm. 112,1; Cedren. 605,13; Theod. Scut. 83,21; Zonar. III. 119,3
John the Baptist's relics (head) in Emesa	NO	K 591,7–12	
Anthemius founds the church of S. Thomas in Rome	NO	L 14–16	
Marcianus for the Blues	34, first part	O 592,10–14	
Marcianus' death & rise of Leo	34, second part	P 16–19	

Malalas is repeatedly wrong here, misplacing events such as Theodosius II's death (after the sack of Rome in 455, instead of 450), Valentinianus' death (under Theodosius II, as a consequence of the previous error), Pulcheria's death (only two years before Marcianus', i.e. 455, instead of four, i.e. 453).

None of these errors occurs in the CP; moreover, the latter follows a chronological order of the events, while Malalas alters the expected sequence in his narration no less than six times.⁸

Table 2. Theodosius II & Marcianus. CP's order against Malalas

Contents	CP, p. Dindorf	Malal. XIV, chapt.
Nestorius and the council of Ephesus (431)	581,11–20	25 [FAR LATER than expected]
II council of Ephesus,	A 587,3–6 [s.a. 450 instead of 449, CP's error]	NO
Attila's threat to both <i>partes imperii</i>	B 587,7–588,5 περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θράξ.	10 περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θράξ.
Cyrus' disgrace	C 588,6–589,5	16
Earthquake in Constantinople	D 589,6–16 [with additions NOT from Malal.]	22
Theodosius II's death	E 589,17–590,5	27 [Malalas'ERROR: after the sack of Rome]
Chrysaphius' death	F 590,6–7	32
Marcianus emperor	G 590,6–15	28
Pulcheria finds relics of the 40 martyrs	H 590,16–20	NO
Council in Chalcedon	I 591,1–4 [s.a. 452 instead of 451; with additions]	30

⁸ Which is an exception to Malalas'rule, see SCOTT, R., Malalas' sources for the contemporary books. In: MEIER, – CARRARA – RADTKL (n. 1), forthcoming: "it is only in Book XIV that the chronicler Malalas abandons a strict chronological narrative, and evidently has done so quite deliberately".

Contents	CP, p. Dindorf	Malal. XIV, chapt.
Pulcheria's death	J 6	34, third part [455, <i>Malalas'</i> ERROR]
John the Baptist's relics (head) in Emesa	K 591,7–12	NO
Anthemius founds the church of S. Thomas in Rome	L 14–16	NO
Valentinianus' death	M 591,19–592,1	14 [<i>Malalas'</i> ERROR: under Theodosius II]
Gaiseric invades Rome	N 592,2–7	26
Marcianus for the Blues	O 592,10–14	34, first part
Marcianus' death & rise of Leo	P 16–19	34, second part
Ransom of Eudossia and Placidia from Gaiseric	U 594,4–10 [with additions]	31

There are errors also on *CP's* part: e.g., the second Council of Ephesus is posited *sub a.* 450 instead of 449; the Chalcedonian one *sub a.* 452 instead of 451. On the other hand, *Malalas* prefers to go back to the first council of Ephesus (431), a flashback which fits not very well in this section from the late 440s-early 450s, without even a mention of the second namesake synodus. For him, the so-called “robbery of Ephesus” from 449 has simply never existed.

1. b) Remarks

Doubtless, *Malalas'* errors were not added by the epitomist of O (the codex Baroccianus),⁹ because the other early witnesses, both *Fragmentum Tusculanum* 3 and the Slavonic translation, are present throughout.¹⁰

Factual errors can have been corrected and the chronological sequence reconstructed by the *CP* against the Constantinopolitan city chronicle, or against any other source with the main events in 5th century; yet a *CP's* direct dependence on *Malalas* is not sustainable here.

⁹ About the epitome of *Malalas'* text in the codex Baroccianus see e.g. MEIER – DROSIHN – PRIWITZER (n. 2), 22ff.

¹⁰ For the *Fragmenta Tusculana* see SCHULZ, F., *Fragmentum Tusculanum II* und die Geschichte eines Zankapfels. In: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 153–166, with further bibliography; about the Slavonic translation (Slav), see THURN, J., Einleitung. Quellen, Parallelen, Testimonia. 2. Die slavische Übersetzung. In: *Joannis Malalae Chronographia* (n. 5) 14*–15*.

Various situations can be supposed here, if we accept that Eustathius of Epiphania¹¹ was the intermediary for such historical news/text section: (a) either the *CP* draws directly on Eustathius himself, which is misunderstood or mistreated by Malalas, or (b) the *CP* is able to correct Malalas collating Eustathius and/or the so-called Constantinopolitan city chronicle, or even (c) the errors are by Eustathius, while Malalas/*CP* check and correct the errors, respectively, drawing on other sources for different parts from each other.

2. a) Priscus and Malalas/*CP* about Attila [very close, sometimes identical]

Here comes Priscus on stage. Unfortunately, none of the passages is exactly overlapping with the *Excerpta de Legationibus* (*EL*), which preserved the most of the so-called genuine Priscus.¹² However, some contents is significantly related to the author of Panion: see e.g. his explicit quotation by name in Malalas XIV 10 and *CP* 588,4–5:¹³

Malal. <i>Chronogr.</i> XIV 10 (279 Thurn)	<i>CP</i> 588,4–5 Dindorf
Prisc. fr. 21,1 (p. 308 Blockley) = cfr. exc. 3a* (p. 9 Carolla, in app.) περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θραξ.	Prisc. exc. 3a (p. 9 Carolla) περί οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θραξ.

At the end of the relevant passage, the very same quotation in Malalas and the *CP* points to a common source, which may well be Eustathius. This is confirmed by some errors in common between the two, as can be seen in the text (Table 3):

¹¹ For Eustathius of Epiphania see

¹² Distinctions about genuinity must be made from time to time, because the excerptor(es) cut-and-pasted the text under Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (10th cent.): see CAROLLA, P., *L'edizione critica dei cosiddetti Excerpta Constantiniana de legationibus Romanorum*. Problemi filologici e risorse di metodo. In: AMATO, E. – LANÇON, B. – DE CICCIO, P. – MOREAU, T. (eds.), *Les historiens fragmentaires de langue grecque à l'époque impériale et tardive. Actes de le colloque international à l'Université de Nantes 26-28 novembre 2015* (forthcoming); for the excerptor as, possibly, the anonymous author of the so-called Theophanes Continuatus, see CODOÑER-FEATHERSTONE 2015, *passim*. For essential bibliography about the *EL*, see NÉMETH, A., *Imperial Systematization of the Past. Emperor Constantine VII and His Historical Excerpts*. Doctoral Thesis submitted to Central European University, Department of Medieval Studies, Budapest 2010 (online); a comprehensive contribution by Paolo Odorico and an article by L. M. Ciolfi, Fr. Monticini et alii are forthcoming in *Byzantinoslavica* 2017.

¹³ See the remarks by GASTGEBER, Chr., *Die Osterchronik und Johannes Malalas*. In: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 187–224: 220–223. However, the important λέγει may well indicate Eustathius or another intermediary, instead of Malalas.

Table 3. The story of Attila: closeness between Malalas and CP

Malal. <i>Chronographia</i> XIV 10 (279 Thurn)	CP 587,7–588,5 Dindorf (s. a. 450)
<p>Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ καὶ Βαλεντινιανοῦ ἐπεστράτευσε κατὰ Ῥώμης καὶ κατὰ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἀττιλᾶς ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν Γηπέδων Οὔννων, πλῆθος ἔχων μυριάδων πολλῶν, δηλώσας διὰ Γότθου ἐνὸς πρεσβευτοῦ τῷ Βαλεντινιανῷ βασιλεῖ Ῥώμης ἑκέλευσέν σοι δι' ἐμοῦ ὁ δεσπότης μου καὶ δεσπότης σου Ἀττιλᾶς, ἵνα εὐτρεπίσης αὐτῷ τὸ παλάτιόν σου. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Θεοδοσίῳ βασιλεῖ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐδήλωσε δι' ἐνὸς Γότθου πρεσβευτοῦ. καὶ ἀκηκοὺς Ἀέτιος ὁ πρῶτος συγκλητικὸς Ῥώμης τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τόλμαν τῆς ἀπονεννοημένης ἀποκρίσεως Ἀττιλᾶ ἀπῆλθε πρὸς Ἀλάριχον πρὸς τοὺς Γάλλους, ὄντα ἐχθρὸν Ῥωμαίων διὰ Ὀνώριον, καὶ προετρέψατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἡνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἅμα αὐτῷ κατὰ Ἀττιλᾶ. ἀπώλεσε γὰρ πόλεις πολλὰς τῆς Ῥώμης. καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐπιρρίψαντες αὐτῷ, ὡς ἐστὶν ἀπληκεύων πλησίον τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ, ἔκοψαν αὐτῶν χιλιάδας πολλὰς. εἰς δὲ τὴν συμβολὴν πληγὴν λαβὼν ὁ Ἀλάριχος ἀπὸ σαγίτας ἐτελεύτησεν.</p>	<p>Ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Θεοδοσίου καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Αὐγούστων ἐπεστράτευσεν κατὰ Ῥώμης καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἀττίλας ὁ ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν Γηπέδων Οὔννων, ἔχων πλῆθος μυριάδων πολλῶν. καὶ ἐδήλωσεν διὰ Γότθου ἐνὸς πρεσβευτοῦ Οὐαλεντινιανῷ βασιλεῖ Ῥώμης, ἑκέλευσέ σοι δι' ἐμοῦ ὁ δεσπότης μου καὶ δεσπότης σου Ἀττίλας ἵνα εὐτρεπίσης αὐτῷ παλάτιν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Θεοδοσίῳ βασιλεῖ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐδήλωσεν δι' ἐνὸς Γότθου πρεσβευτοῦ. καὶ ἀκηκοὺς Ἀέτιος ὁ πρῶτος συγκλητικὸς Ῥώμης τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τόλμαν τῆς ἀπονεννοημένης ἀποκρίσεως Ἀττίλα, ἀπῆλθε πρὸς Ἀλλάριχον εἰς τὰς Γαλλίας, ὄντα ἐχθρὸν Ῥώμης διὰ Ὀνώριον, καὶ προετρέψατο αὐτὸν ἅμα αὐτῷ κατὰ Ἀττίλα, ἐπειδὴ ἀπώλεσεν πόλεις πολλὰς τῆς Ῥώμης. καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐπιρρίψαντες αὐτῷ, ὡς ἔστιν ἡπληκευμένος πλησίον τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ, ἔκοψαν αὐτοῦ χιλιάδας πολλὰς εἰς δὲ τὴν συμβολὴν ὁ Ἀλλάριχος πληγὴν λαβὼν ἀπὸ (588.) σαγίτας τελευτᾷ.</p>

<p>ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀττίλας ἐτελεύτησεν, καταφορὰ αἵματος διὰ τῶν ῥινῶν ἐνεχθεῖσα νυκτός, μετὰ Οὐννας παλλακίδος αὐτοῦ καθεύδων· ἥτις κόρη καὶ ὑπενοήθη, ὅτι αὐτὴ αὐτὸν ἀνείλεν.</p> <p>περὶ οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θράξ.¹⁴</p> <p>ἕτεροι δὲ συνεγράψαντο, ὅτι Ἀέτιος ὁ πατρίκιος τὸν σπαθάριον αὐτοῦ ὑπενόθευσεν, καὶ αὐτὸς κεντήσας ἀνείλεν αὐτόν· καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ὁ πατρίκιος Ἀέτιος νικήσας.¹⁵</p>	<p>ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀττίλας τελευτᾷ καταφορᾷ αἵματος διὰ τῶν ῥινῶν ἐνεχθεῖς νυκτός μετὰ Οὐννας παλλακίδος αὐτοῦ καθεύδων, ἥτις κόρη καὶ ὑπενοήθη ὅτι αὐτὴ ἀνείλεν αὐτόν·</p> <p>περὶ οὗ πολέμου συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Πρίσκος ὁ Θράξ.¹⁶</p>
---	--

¹⁴ Translation by JEFFREYS – JEFFREYS – SCOTT (n. 7) 195–196: During his and Valentinian's reign, a campaign against Rome and Constantinople was begun by Attila, of the race of the Gepids, with a host of many tens of thousands. He sent a message through a Gothic ambassador to Valentinian, emperor of Rome, "Attila, my master and yours, commands you through me to make ready your palace for him". Likewise he sent the same message to the emperor Theodosius in Constantinople, through a Gothic ambassador. When Aetius, the leading senator of Rome, heard the incredible boldness of Attila's reckless message, he went off to Theoderic in Gaul. Though Theoderic was an enemy of the Romans, he was persuaded to join him against Attila, who had attacked many Roman cities. They made a sudden assault on Attila, as he was making camp near the river Danube, and cut down many thousands of his men. In this battle Theoderic was wounded by an arrow and died. Equally Attila died, suffering a haemorrhage through the nose at night, while he was sleeping with his Hunnish concubine. This girl was suspected of having murdered him. The history of this war has been written by the most learned Priscus, the Thracian.

¹⁵ JEFFREYS – JEFFREYS – SCOTT (n. 7) 196: Others, however, have written that Aetius the patrician bribed Attila's spatharius, who stabbed and killed him, and that Aetius returned victorious to Rome. This is the passage that made E. Jeffreys think that Malalas consulted directly Priscus to be sure about a very interesting event, like elsewhere with Magnus of Carthage for Julian's death.

¹⁶ Translation by Michael and Mary Whitby (n. 2) 77: In the reign of Theodosius and Valentinian Augusti, Attila, who was from the race of the Gepid Huns, marched against Rome and Constantinople with a horde of many tens of thousands. And by means of a certain Goth ambassador he declared to Valentinian emperor of Rome, "My master and your master Attila commands you through me to make ready a palace for him". And likewise also to Theodosius the emperor he made the same declaration in Constantinople by means of a certain Goth ambassador. And when Aetius, the first senator at Rome, heard of the exceeding audacity of Attila's senseless dispatch, he departed for Gaul to Alaric, who was hostile to Rome on account of Honorius, and persuaded him to go with him against Attila since he had destroyed many of Rome's cities. And they suddenly rushed upon him when he was encamped near the river Danube, and cut down many thousands of his men. In the engagement Alaric received a wound from (588) an arrow and died. Similarly Attila too died, carried off by a downrush of blood through the nostrils during the night while he was sleeping with a Hunnish concubine; the girl was indeed suspected of having killed him herself. The most learned Priscus the Thracian has written the history of this war.

This is a good sample of the so-called “little rewriting” of Malalas by the CP, in Elizabeth Jeffreys’s words:¹⁷ transpositions, synonyms and, conversely, also a goldmine of corrections/integrations for Thurn’s edition.

Let us consider some passages of Priscus which are consistent with the text above because of Attila’s claims (2b), the negotiations about Justa Grata Honoria (2c) and Attila’s death (2d):

2. b) Attila’s claims to be master of the emperors

See Priscus exc. 8,137–138 (pp. 40–41 Carolla), where Romulus, the Western ambassador to Attila in 449AD, explains the reason why Attila has become excessively proud:

137 Ἀποθαυμαζόντων δὲ ἡμῶν τῆς ἀπονοίας τὸν βάρβαρον, ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Ῥωμύλος, πρεσβευτῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ πολλῶν πραγμάτων ἐμπειρος, ἔλεγεν τὴν αὐτοῦ μεγίστην τύχην καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς τύχης δύναμιν ἐξαίρειν αὐτόν, ὥστε μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι δικαίων λόγων εἰ μὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν νομίσαι ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς.

138 Οὕτω γάρ, τῶν πώποτε τῆς Σκυθικῆς ἢ καὶ ἐτέρας ἀρξάντων γῆς, τοσαῦτα ἐν ὀλίγῳ κατεπράχθη, ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Ὠκεανῷ νήσων ἄρχειν καὶ πρὸς πάσῃ τῇ Σκυθικῇ καὶ Ῥωμαίους ἔχειν ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν· ἐφιέμενον δὲ πρὸς τοῖς παροῦσι πλειόνων καὶ ἐπὶ μείζον αὐξοντα τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ ἐς Πέρσας ἐπιέναι βούλεσθαι.¹⁸

Ibid., 144–145, where Constantiolus, another Western man arrived at the court of Attila, is more accurate regarding Attila’s threat to both *partes imperii*:

¹⁷ JEFFREYS (n. 2) 252: *When the CP has taken material over from Malalas there is little rewriting and thus these passages form an extremely useful check on the text preserved in Ba [i.e., the codex Baroccianus, see n. 9]; the chief exceptions are dates by the Roman calendar (e.g. at XIV 4, Bo 355; cf. CP 578) which –since these are not normally part of Malalas’ chronological system– are always likely to be insertions. As a general principle, the CP’s scientific approach to the astronomical basis of his calculations makes M. seem a headstrong amateur. About CP’s chronological system compared to Malalas’, see JUHÁSZ, E., Die Indiktionsangaben bei Johannes Malalas und in der Osterchronik, in: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 225–237; see also her contribution in this volume.*

¹⁸ Translation by GIVEN (n. 4) 68 (see fr. 11,2, p. 277 BLOCKLEY [n. 7]): *As we marveled at the barbarian’s senselessness, Romulus, a very experienced ambassador, said that Attila’s brilliant good fortune and the power derived from it had raised him so high that he would not endure righteous words unless he believed they benefited him. (138) “No ruler of Scythia,” he said, “or any other land ever accomplished so many things in such a short time: ruling the islands in the Ocean and requiring even Romans, let alone all Scythia, to pay tribute.” He added that Attila longed to add still more to his present possessions, to increase his empire, and so wanted to attack the Persians too.*

144 Ἡμῶν δὲ κατὰ Περσῶν ἔλθειν αὐτὸν ἐπευξαμένων καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνους τρέψαι τὸν πόλεμον, ὁ Κωνσταντίολος ἔλεγεν δεδιέναι μήποτε, καὶ Πέρσας ῥαδίως παραστήσμενος, ἀντὶ φίλου δεσπότης ἐπανήξει· νῦν μὲν γὰρ τὸ χρυσίον κομίζεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν τῆς ἀξίας ἔνεκα, εἰ δὲ καὶ Πάρθους καὶ Μήδους καὶ Πέρσας παραστήσοιτο οὐκ ἔτι Ῥωμαίων ἀνέξεσθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ νοσφιζομένων ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ θεράποντας περιφανῶς ἡγησάμενον χαλεπώτερα ἐπιτάξειν καὶ οὐκ ἀνεκτὰ ἐκείνοις ἐπιτάγματα.

145 Ἦν δὲ ἀξία, ἣς ὁ Κωνσταντίολος ἐπεμνήσθη, στρατηγοῦ Ῥωμαίων, ἣς χάριν ὁ Ἀττήλας παρὰ βασιλέως ἐδέδεκτο, τὸ τοῦ φορου ἐπικαλύπτοντος ὄνομα, ὥστε αὐτῷ, σιτηρεσίου προφάσει τοῦ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς χορηγουμένου, τὰς συντάξεις ἐκπέμπεσθαι.¹⁹

The information provided by Malalas and the *CP* in the passage quoted above (Table 3), however reworked and rewritten, are a fulfilment of the prophecy at the end of Priscus' exc. 8, 144: θεράποντας περιφανῶς ἡγησάμενον χαλεπώτερα ἐπιτάξειν καὶ οὐκ ἀνεκτὰ ἐκείνοις ἐπιτάγματα: Attila comes so far that he "openly" considers the emperors as "his servants" and issues "harsher and unbearable commands to them".

2. c) Negotiations about Justa Grata Honoria

Blockley has highlighted that ἀποκρίσεως, both in Malalas and *CP*, means an answer to a previous embassy and that the most probable is the *repeated rejection of his demand for Honoria*,²⁰ the sister of Valentinianus who sent her ring to Attila, asking for his help against her brother Valentinianus: see Priscus' exc. 15,1–3; exc. 16,3; exc. 17, from Jordanes' *Getica* 222–223.²¹

Malalas does not mention Justa Grata Honoria and her private negotiations with Attila; the *CP* bears no trace of her, although misnaming Honoria

¹⁹ Transl. by GIVEN (n. 4) 69 (see fr. 11, 2, p. 279 BLOCKLEY [n. 7]): *We prayed he would go against the Persians and turn his warmongering against them, but Constantiolus said he feared that, even if Attila easily brought the Persians under his sway, he would return as a master, not a friend. Even now, he said, they were paying him gold because of his rank, but if he should bring the Parthians, Medes and Persians under his sway, he would no longer tolerate the Romans' depriving him of power. Rather, he would openly consider them his servants and would issue harsher and unbearable commands to them. (145) The rank Constantiolus mentioned was a Roman generalship, the favor of which Attila had received from the emperor. It was a disguise for the word "tribute," so that levies were being sent to him under the pretense of tax proceeds distributed to generals.*

²⁰ BLOCKLEY (n. 7) 391. n. 109, referring to his fr. 21, 1, 9 p. 308 from CP 587f.

²¹ See also Prisc. fr. *dubium* 62*, pp. 90–91 Carolla = Joh. Antioch. Fr. 292 Roberto = fr. 223 Mariev; Prisc. fr. *dub.* 65*, p. 93 Carolla = Theoph. AM 5943 = [Prisc.] 21,2 Blockley).

a daughter of Eudoxia and Valentinianus, which in fact was called Eudocia: elder than Placidia, Eudocia was forced by the Vandals to marry Gaiseric's son Honorichus (Hunerich), see Prisc. exc. 29,3 (pp. 67–68 Carolla) and CP 592,5–6 Dindorf; Placidia and her mother Eudoxia were ransomed under the emperor Leo (ca. 461). Here a common scribal mistake (Honorina instead of Eudocia because of Honorichus in the same passage) is highly probable, in the CP or in its source.²² We are going to come back to this passage.

2. d) Attila's death

About the true version of Attila's death we are informed by Jordanes, *Getica* 254 (p. 104–105 Giunta Grillone²³) = Prisc. exc. 23 (p. 62 Carolla) = Prisc. fr. 24,1 (p. 316 Blockley):

*Qui [sc. Attila], ut Priscus historicus refert, exitus sui tempore puellam Ildico nomine, decoram valed sibi in matrimonio post innumerabiles uxores, ut mos erat gentis illius, socios; eiusque in nuptiis hilaritate nimia resolutus, vino somnoque gravatus, resupinus iacebat. Redundans sanguis, qui ei solite de naribus effluebat, dum consuetis meatibus impeditur, itinere ferali faucibus illapsus eum extinxit: ita glorioso per bella regi temulentia pudendos exitus dedit. Sequenti vero luce, cum magna pars diei fuit exempta, ministri regii, triste aliquid suspicantes, maximos fores effringunt inveniuntque Attilae sine ullo vulnere necem, sanguinis effusione peractam, puellamque dimisso vultu sub velamine lacrimantem.*²⁴

²² See table with the text, infra: Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ζινζίριχος βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀφρων εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ παρέλαβεν Εὐδοξίαν τὴν γυναῖκα Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ καὶ τὰς δύο αὐτῆς θυγατέρας, Πλακιδίαν καὶ Ὀνωρίαν, ἃς μετ' ὀλίγον ἀγοράζει ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας Λέων ὁ βασιλεὺς. τὴν δὲ Ὀνωρίαν νύμφην ἐκράτησεν Ζινζίριχος εἰς Ὀνώριχον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.

²³ *Iordanis de origine actibusque Getarum*, GIUNTA, F. – GRILLONE, A. (eds.), (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 117) Roma 1991.

²⁴ Translation by GIVEN (n. 4) 112: *At the time of his death, as Priscus the historian reports, Attila married an exceedingly beautiful girl, Ildico by name, the last of his innumerable wives, as was the custom of that nation. Unwound by the excessive partying at his wedding and weighed down by wine and sleep, he was lying on his back. He often had nosebleeds, but his blood now flowed backward, since it was prevented from following its accustomed course, and spilled down a deadly journey into his throat, killing him. Thus intoxication brought a shameful death to a king glorious in war. Late the following day, royal courtiers, suspecting something sorrowful, broke through the great doors and discovered Attila's unwounded corpse. They saw that the death had been caused by a hemorrhage, and they found the girl crying under a cover, her face turned down.*

Jordanes quotes Priscus here, like Malalas and the CP, but is more accurate than both: he gives the name of the girl and says that Attila had just married her, *the last of his innumerable wives, as was the custom of that nation*.²⁵ This is a clear link to what Priscus reports about the Huns in the exc. 8,63 (p. 28 Carolla):

63 ἐτέραν ὁδὸν ἐτράπημεν, τῶν ξεναγούντων ἡμᾶς Σκυθῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖν παρακελευσαμένων, ὡς τοῦ Ἀττίλα ἐς κώμην τινὰ παρεσομένου, ἐν ᾗ γαμεῖν θυγατέρα Ἑσκάμ ἐβούλετο, πλείστας μὲν ἔχων γαμετάς, ἀγόμενος δὲ καὶ ταύτην κατὰ νόμον τὸν Σκυθικόν.²⁶

Ildico was another of many wives, although Malalas and the CP have her as a concubine: a common source between them is confirmed by this error. Blockley²⁷ argues for Eustathius, as a parallel passage in Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos quotes him;²⁸ I am not convinced, since Nicephorus writes that Attila dies by a spear²⁹ together with the so-called “Allarichus” (instead of Theuderichus). Nicephorus does not mention the other version (death by hemorrhage), continues with Areobindus’ victory on the Persian Anabazanes and concludes the section with these sentences: “Ἄ δὴ πολλοὶς μὲν ἰστόρηται, ἐπιτέμνεται δὲ μάλα κομπῶς καὶ Εὐσταθίῳ τῷ ἐξ Ἐπιφανείας τῷ Σύρῳ, ὃς καὶ τὴν Ἀμίδης ἄλῳσιν συνεγράψατο· ἐν ᾧ συνήκμασαν Κλαυδιανός τε καὶ Κύρος οἱ ποιηταί.”³⁰

Here Nicephorus summarizes all the events under Theodosius II, with a focus on the Eastern border toward Persia: Attila is only one of the main two

²⁵ GIVEN (n. 4) 112, see above.

²⁶ Given’s translation (n. 4), 56: “[...] then we took a different road. The Scythians who were guiding us told us to do this because Attila was going to a village where he wanted to marry the daughter of Eskam. Attila already had very many wives, but he was marrying her too in accordance with Scythian custom.”

²⁷ Blockley (n. 7), 391 nn. 110-11.

²⁸ About Nicephorus and the forthcoming new critical edition of his text see GASTGEBER, Chr., Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos. Ihre Entdeckung und Verwendung in der Zeit der Reformation. *Ostkirchliche Studien* 58 (2009), 237-247; GASTGEBER, CHR./PANTEGHINI, S. (eds.), *Ecclesiastical History and Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos*. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Vienna, 15th-16th Dec., 2011, (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 37) Wien 2015.

²⁹ NICEPHORI CALLISTI XANTHOPULI *Historia Ecclesiastica* XIV 57, PG 146, 1272 A 10-11 “Ἐνθα δὴ καὶ Ἀττίλας αὐτῶν δόρατι κεντηθεὶς διεφθάρη.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, B 12-13; my translation: These events have been written by many historians, but Eustathius of Epiphaneia the Syrian has very cleverly epitomized them; he described also the fall of Amida, a period when Claudianus and Cyrus the poets flourished together.

dangers the Empire has just escaped. Moreover, Nicephorus points out that many historians have written these events but Eustathius is the best epitomizer, so to speak:³¹ this makes one think that

- a) either Eustathius summarized many versions of Attila's death (the spear, the hemorrhage, the murder planned by Aetius) of which the last two versions found their way to Malalas;
- b) or Nicephorus picked up Eustathius' version and Attila's hemorrhage was not believed/transmitted by the latter.

2. e) Remarks

What we can infer from this comparison of Priscus, Malalas, the *CP* and Nicephorus Callistus?

Dariusz Brodka³² has brilliantly traced streams of Priscan tradition in Malalas-Nicephorus which are likely to have come via Eustathius, because of some relevant common errors (especially Malal. XIV 10 and 16). Some of them can be common cut-and-paste errors, while others are more important: the ones easily made by chroniclers while summarizing a long and complex political history. Based on Priscus, already Eustathius can have been mistaken in simplifying or shortening, e.g. conflating the battle at the Cathalaunian Camps, in Gaul (451), with the Eastern military intervention along the Danube an year later (452); on top, Malalas added his own misunderstandings, as has been shown here in the "garbled account"³³

So, we can come back to the main point: where can the *CP* have found the corrections against Malalas?

³¹ KIERKEGAARD, S., *Writings II. The Concept of Irony*, Hong, H.V. – Hong, E. H. (eds.), (Kierkegaard's Writings) Princeton 1992, 441: "since Hegel says with authority that the mind is the best epitomizer (see the *Introduction* to his *Philosophie der Geschichte*, p. 8) [...]".

³² For a comprehensive frame, see the painstaking care on Eustathius' traces by BRODKA, D., *Wege und Irrwege der byzantinischen Historiographie. Quellenkritische Studie zur Priskos-Tradition bei Eustathios von Epiphaneia, Johannes Malalas, Theophanes und Nikephoros Kallistos. RhM* 155 (2012) 185–209; esp. 197–204; specifically on Malalas and Nicephorus Callistus BRODKA, D., *Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas und die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Xanthopoulos Kallistos*. In: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 287–310; on Eustathius, see also BRODKA, D., *Eustathios von Epiphaneia und Johannes Malalas*. In: MEIER – CARRARA – RADTKI (n. 1) forthcoming.

³³ BLOCKLEY (n. 7) 391. n. 111 about Malal. XIV 10.

3. a) Gaiseric and the sack of Rome (455): CP's independence from Malalas?

About Gaiseric's sack of Rome in 455, Malalas and the CP have two different versions, even though the latter seems an abbreviation:

Table 4. Malal. XIV 26 and CP 592,2–7

<p>Ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ διάγουσα χήρα ἡ δέσποινα Εὐδοξία, ἡ γεναμένη γυνὴ Βαλεντινιανοῦ βασιλέως, θυγάτηρ δὲ Θεοδοσίου βασιλέως καὶ Εὐδοκίας, λυπούμενη κατὰ Μαξίμου τοῦ τυράννου τοῦ φονεύσαντος τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ βασιλεύσαντος, προετρέψατο Ζινζίριχον τὸν Οὐάνδαλον, τὸν ῥῆγα τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, ἔλθειν κατὰ Μαξίμου βασιλέως καὶ τῆς Ῥώμης. ὅστις ἐξαίφνης ἦλθεν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πόλει μετὰ πλήθους καὶ παρέλαβεν τὴν Ῥώμην, καὶ ἐφόνευσεν τὸν Μάξιμον βασιλέα καὶ πάντας ἀπόλεσε, πραιδεύσας πάντα τὰ τοῦ παλατίου ἕως τῶν χαλκουργημάτων, λαβὼν αἰχμαλώτους καὶ τοὺς περιλειφθέντας συγκλητικούς καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν, ἐν οἷς ἔλαβε καὶ τὴν προτρεψαμένην αὐτὸν τὴν δέσποιναν Εὐδοξίαν καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτῆς Πλακιδίαν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πατρικίου Ὀλυβρίου, αὐτοῦ διάγοντος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, καὶ Εὐδοκίαν δὲ τὴν παρθένον αἰχμαλώτους καὶ ἀπήγαγε πάντας ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ ἐν Καρταγένῃ πόλει. ὅστις Ζινζίριχος εὐθέως ἐξέδωκε τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ νιῷ Ὀνωρίχῳ τὴν θυγατέρα Εὐδοξίαν τῆς δεσποίνης τὴν παρθένον Εὐδοκίαν τὴν μικράν· καὶ εἶχεν αὐτὰς ἐν τιμῇ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ.³⁴</p>	<p>Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ζινζίριχος βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀφρων εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ παρέλαβεν Εὐδοξίαν τὴν γυναῖκα Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ καὶ τὰς δύο αὐτῆς θυγατέρας, Πλακιδίαν καὶ Ὀνωρίαν, ἃς μετ' ὀλίγον ἀγοράζει ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας Λέων ὁ βασιλεὺς. τὴν δὲ Ὀνωρίαν νύμφην ἐκράτησεν Ζινζίριχος εἰς Ὀνωρίχον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.³⁵</p>
--	---

³⁴ Malal. Chron. 14,26, translation by JEFFREYS – JEFFREYS – SCOTT, p. 200: *At that time, the lady Eudoxia, wife of the emperor Valentinian but now widowed, daughter of emperor Theodosius and Eudokia, was living in Rome. She was displeased with Maximus the rebel, who had murdered her husband and become emperor, and so she urged the Vandal Geiseric, the king of Africa, to move against Maximus, emperor of Rome. Geiseric (366) suddenly arrived at the city of Rome with a large force and captured Rome. He killed the emperor Maximus and slaughtered everybody, plundering everything in the palace down to the bronze statues, and taking the surviving senators prisoner together with their wives. Amongst these he also took prisoner the lady Eudoxia,*

Malalas presents Eudoxia inviting the Vandal king against the usurper Maximus, says that Gaiseric murders Maximus and gives a detailed account about his killing, plundering and taking excellent prisoners. This is also the version of Jordanes, *Romana* 334.³⁶

On the contrary, the *CP* mentions that Maximus is slain, then Gaiseric comes to Rome and takes away Eudoxia and her two daughters (where the *CP* misnames Eudocia/Honorina the younger, 592,5–6 Dindorf).³⁷

John of Antioch gives both versions in a context which is likely Priscan. I numbered it as *fr. dubium* 71* and italicized, as usual, what does not fit in linguistic and stylistic *usus scribendi* of Priscus: this means that the Roman character *can* be genuine Priscus (even though not necessarily).

who had urged him to attack, and her daughter Placidia, wife of the patrician Olybrius, who himself was living in Constantinople, and the virgin Eudokia. He carried them all off to the city of Carthage in Africa. Geiseric immediately gave the virgin Eudokia the younger, lady Eudoxia's daughter, in marriage to his own son Huneric. He kept the ladies with him in honourable captivity. The emperor Theodosius learnt that it was at the instigation of his own daughter Eudoxia that Rome had been betrayed. He was displeased with her and let her stay in Africa with Geiseric, without communicating with him. But he made a processus from Constantinople to Ephesos, a city in Asia. There he prayed to St. John the Theologian, asking who would reign after him. He received the answer in a vision and returned to Constantinople.

³⁵ Translation by WHITBY – WHITBY (n. 2) 83: *And Zinzerich king of the Africans entered Rome and captured Eudoxia, the wife of Valentinian, and her two daughters, Placidia and Honorina; after a short time Leo the emperor ransomed them from captivity. But Zinzerich retained Honorina as bride for Honarich his son.*

³⁶ Quoted in app ad Prisc. fr. dub. 71*, p. 99 Carolla.

³⁷ Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἐσφάγη Οὐαλεντινιανὸς Αὐγουστος ἐν Ῥώμῃ μέσον δύο δαφνῶν, καὶ ἐπύρθη βασιλεὺς Μάξιμος, καὶ ἐσφάγη καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ζινζίριχος βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀφρων εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ παρέλαβεν Εὐδοξίαν τὴν γυναῖκα Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ καὶ τὰς δύο αὐτῆς θυγατέρας, Πλακιδίαν καὶ Ὀνωρίαν, ἃς μετ' ὀλίγον ἀγοράζει ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας Λέων ὁ βασιλεὺς. τὴν δὲ Ὀνωρίαν νύμφην ἐκράτησεν Ζινζίριχος εἰς Ὀνώριχον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.

Table 5. John of Antioch about Gaiseric and the sack of Rome

Prisc. fr. 71* p. 100 Carolla = Joh. Ant. fr. 293.1 Roberto = Joh. Ant. fr. 224.4 Mariev
<p>Οὕτω μὲν οὖν Μάξιμος ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν ἦλθε. Καὶ Γιζέριχος, ὁ τῶν Βανδήλων ἄρχων, τὴν Ἀετίου καὶ Βαλεντινιανοῦ ἀναίρεσιν ἐγνωκώς, ἐπιτίθεσθαι ταῖς Ἰταλίαις καιρὸν ἡγησάμενος, ὡς τῆς μὲν εἰρήνης θανάτῳ τῶν σπεισασμένων λυθείσης, τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν παρελθόντος μὴ ἀξιόχρεων κεκτημένου δύναμιν, οἱ δὲ φασὶ καὶ ὡς Εὐδοξίας τῆς Βαλεντινιανοῦ γαμετῆς ὑπὸ ἀνίας διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναίρεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν γάμων ἀνάγκην λάθρα ἐπικαλεσαμένης αὐτόν, σὺν πολλῷ στόλῳ καὶ τῷ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἔθνει ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄφρων ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην διέβαινεν. Ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἀζέστῳ (τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Ῥώμης ἐγγύς) τὸν Γιζέριχον ὁ Μάξιμος ἔγνω στρατοπεδεύομενον, περιδεῆς γενόμενος, ἔφευγεν ἵππῳ ἀναβάς, καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλικῶν δορυφόρων καὶ τῶν ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἐλευθέρων, οἱς μάλιστα ἐκεῖνος ἐπίστευεν, ἀπολιπόντων, οἱ ὀρώντες ἐξελαύνοντα ἐλοιδόρουν τε καὶ δειλίαν ὠνείδιζον· τῆς δὲ πόλεως ἐξίεναι μέλλοντα βαλὼν τις λίθον κατὰ τοῦ κροτάφου ἀνείλε καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἐπελθὼν τὸν τε νεκρὸν δίσπασε καὶ τὰ μέλη ἐπὶ κοντῷ φέρον ἐπαιωνίζετο. Ταύτης μὲν οὖν ἐκεῖνος ἔτυχε τῆς τοῦ βίου καταστροφῆς, ἐπὶ τῇ τυραννίδι μὴνῶν αὐτῷ διαγενομένων τριῶν. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ Γιζέριχος ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐσέβαλε.³⁸</p>

John of Antioch reports both versions, but Maximus is undoubtedly slain before Gaiseric enters Rome, like in the CP.³⁹ Moreover, the second version is reported by John in non-Priscan style, while the rest of the sentence fits very well in the *usus* of the author from Panion.⁴⁰

This is why I suspect that Priscus was directly used here by John of Antioch, along with another source (Eustathius via an intermediary), and that the CP draws on a better intermediary than Malalas' source. Given the resemblance,

³⁸ Translation by MARIEV, S., in *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, MARIEV, S. (ed., transl.), (CFHB 47) Berolini et Novi Eboraci 2008, 411: "Gaiseric, the ruler of the Vandals, heard of the deaths of Aetius and Valentinian and concluded that the time was right for an attack on Italy, since the peace treaty had been dissolved by the deaths of those who had made it and the new incumbent of the imperial office did not have at his disposal an estimable force. Some also say that Eudoxia, the wife of Valentinian, out of distress at the murder of her husband and her forced marriage, secretly summoned Gaiseric, who crossed from Africa to Rome with a large fleet and the nation under his rule. When Maximus learned that Gaiseric was encamped at Azestus [i.e. ad Sextum] (which is a place near Rome), he panicked, mounted a horse and fled. The imperial bodyguard and those free persons in his retinue whom he particularly trusted deserted him, and those who saw him leaving abused him and reviled him for his cowardice. As he was about to leave the city, someone threw a rock, hitting him on the temple and killing him. The crowd fell upon his body, tore it to pieces and with shouts of triumph paraded the limbs about on a pole. Thus he met the end of his life, having usurped power for three months. Meanwhile Gaiseric entered Rome.

³⁹ It is true that the CP has Maximus slaughtered, not stoned to death.

⁴⁰ For σὺν πολλῷ στόλῳ καὶ τῷ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἔθνει see e.g. Prisc. exc. 8, 83 σὺν τῷ παντὶ ἐπηκολοθησαμεν πλήθει; exc. 27, 1 ἐπὶ τὴν Λιβύην σὺν πολλῇ διαβαίνειν ἐπειράτο δυνάμει.

it is possible that this intermediary is the same used by John of Antioch, however we decide to posit him in the timeline.⁴¹

5. Conclusion: Closeness or Independence?

Can all this be due to the differences between two editions of Malalas? While the concept itself of a “second edition” has to be investigated further,⁴² it is hardly to believe that Malalas inserted such a “garbled account” only in the second edition, after looking for other sources than before.

Finally, I do not think that a Constantinopolitan city chronicle would be sufficient to account for better information of the *CP*, given the differences in Priscan material between this section and Marcellinus Comes.

Either the Constantinopolitan city chronicle was far better informed (and fuller) than Marcellinus or the *CP* collated (also) good Priscan material elsewhere, perhaps where also John of Antioch found one of his sources.

My main contribution is in a number of clues which point to the direction of a different-from-Malalas intermediary between Eustathius and the *CP*, in the section which ultimately draws on Priscus of Panion (*CP* 587–594 Dindorf).

Thus none of the three hypothesis mentioned above account for the textual situation as a whole;⁴³ yet they can be verifiable in single Malalas’ chapters/*CP* passages.

The question why the *CP* should have changed (or expanded) a source reference exactly here remains open; but I am tempted to relate this to the fact that only in book 14 Malalas *abandons a strict chronological narrative, and evidently has done so quite deliberately*.⁴⁴ Was he short in his manuscript(s) of Eustathius? Or, quite on the contrary, was he spoilt on choice? In any case, my hypothesis runs somewhat like this: Malalas’ narrative flow stops being chronologically ordered; the *CP* spots the change via a concise chronicle and is able to gain a better source than Malalas: either Eustathius himself, or an intermediary with good Priscan material, perhaps close to the original Priscus also in his wording.

⁴¹ I.e., in 6th or 7th century AD. See MARIEV, S., John of Antioch Reloaded: a Tutorial. In: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 253–265; ROBERTO, U., John Malalas as a Source for John of Antioch’s *Historia Chroniké*. The Evidence of the *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*. In: MEIER – RADTKI – SCHULZ (n. 1) 267–286.

⁴² See Laura Carrara’s contribution in this volume.

⁴³ Namely that (a) either the *CP* draws directly on Eustathius himself, or (b) the *CP* is able to correct Malalas collating Eustathius and/or the so-called Constantinopolitan city chronicle, or even (c) the errors were already in Eustathius, see § 1b. Remarks.

⁴⁴ SCOTT (n. 8).